



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

that plaintiff may show impairment of speech as a part of such injury. *Missouri, etc. R. R. Co. v. Hawk* (1902),—Tex. Civ. App.—, 69 S. W. Rep. 1037.

By the great weight of authority, to prove any special injury it must be specially alleged. If the damages are special they must be based upon allegations in the petition, and there is much reason in holding, as some courts do, that the defendant may take the plaintiff's averments as alleged and assume all special damages to have been included: *WATSON ON DAMAGES*, sec. 822; *Shadock v. Alpine Plank Road Co.* 79 Michigan, 7. AM. AND ENG. ENCYC. LAW, VIII. 544; ENCYC. PLEAD AND PRAC. V. 719-723. Formerly where the petition contained allegations in such general terms as that the plaintiff was rendered sick and physically disabled, many diseases that would not necessarily result from the injury were admitted in evidence. *Ehrgott v. Mayor*, 96 N. Y. 264; *Beath v. Rapid R. R. Co.*, 119 Mich. 512; *Babcock v. St. Paul R. R. Co.* 36 Minn. 147; *Tobin v. Fairport*, 12 N. Y. Supp. 224. Under special allegations courts have been unusually lax in admitting evidence of injuries, of which the petition would in no wise give the defendant notice: *West Chicago R. R. Co. v. Levy*, 182 Ill. 525, 55 N. E. 554; *Tyson v. Booth*, 100 Mass. 258; *Gulf R. R. Co. v. McMannewitz*, 70 Tex. 73; *Baltimore R. R. v. Slanker*, 77 Ill. App. 567. This practice has been limited by many courts and a stricter compliance with the rules of pleading and logic of the law insisted upon. That the plaintiff should be limited to his petition and such injuries as it gives notice of to defendant, is reasonable and fast gaining ground: *Gulf R. R. Co. v. Warlick*, (Ind. Ter. 1896), 35 S. W. 235; *Kleiner v. Third Ave. R. R. Co.*, 162 N. Y. 193, 56 N. E. 497; *Heister v. Loomis*, 47 Mich. 16, 10 N. W. 60; *Baldwin v. R. R. Corporation*, 4 Gray 333; *Kuhn v. Freund*, 87 Mich. 545; *Stevens v. Rodger*, 25 Hun., 54; *SEDGWICK ON DAM.*, secs. 1265-1271; *MAYNE ON DAM.* 6th Ed. 575-578.

**DEED—ACKNOWLEDGMENT.**—The certificate of acknowledgment stated that the deed of James M. Barclay was produced by the said John L. Barclay and acknowledged to be his act and deed. Held that the certificate of acknowledgment was sufficient to entitle the deed to record, and hence it was not error to admit the deed in evidence. *Kentucky Land Co v. Crabtree* (1902), —Ky—, 70 S. W. Rep. 31.

The court said, "it was the purpose of the clerk to certify the deed so as to entitle it to record." When he said it had been acknowledged by the "said" Barclay, we must hold that he referred to the person who had actually signed the deed, and whose name appeared thereto and that the words "John L." are but a mistake in the transcript. A Minnesota case held that a mortgage signed "Wm. Schrieber" and acknowledged "Wm. Strieber," was properly admitted in evidence, the presumption being that the variance in spelling the name was a clerical error. *Rodes v. Elevator Co.*, 49 Minn. 370. To the same effect, see, *Heil v. Redden*, 45 Kan. 562. But in an early Michigan case, a deed signed "Harmon S" and acknowledged "Hiram S." was held inadmissible in evidence to prove a conveyance by "Hiram S." without proof that the person was known by both names. The Texas court held that a deed signed "T. W. C." and acknowledged F. W. C. was not duly registered, hence not admissible in evidence. *Carleton v. Lombardi*, 81 Tex. 355. This view was sustained by *McKenzie v. Stafford* (1894),—Tex. Civ. App.—, 27 S. W. Rep. 790.

**ELECTIONS—BALLOTS—RIGHTS OF NOMINEE TO HAVE HIS NAME APPEAR MORE THAN ONCE UPON THE BALLOT.**—A California statute forbidding the name of a nominee to appear more than once upon the official ballot, provided that in case of nomination by more than one party, the candidate must